

Frequency of Responses: Annually.

Comments: Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request to OMB for approval. All comments will become a matter of public record.

Done in Washington, DC, this 10th day of July, 2015.

Ann Bartuska,

Deputy Under Secretary, Research, Education, and Economics.

[FR Doc. 2015-18058 Filed 7-23-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Rural Utilities Service

Information Collection Activity; Comment Request

AGENCY: Rural Utilities Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended), the Rural Utilities Service (RUS) invites comments on this information collection for which RUS intends to request approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

DATES: Comments on this notice must be received by September 22, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas P. Dickson, Acting Director, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, Rural Utilities Service, 1400 Independence Ave. SW., STOP 1522, Room 5181, South Building, Washington, DC 20250-1522. Telephone: (202) 690-4492. FAX: (202) 720-4120.

Email: Thomas.Dickson@wdc.usda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Office of Management and Budget's (OMB)

regulation (5 CFR 1320) implementing provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13) requires that interested members of the public and affected agencies have an opportunity to comment on information collection and recordkeeping activities (see 5 CFR 1320.8(d)). This notice identifies an information collection that RUS is submitting to OMB for reinstatement.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the Agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Comments may be sent to: Thomas P. Dickson, Acting Director, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, Rural Utilities Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, STOP 1522, 1400 Independence Ave. SW., Washington, DC 20250-1522. FAX: (202) 720-8435.

Title: Lien Accommodations and Subordinations, 7 CFR 1717, Subparts R & S.

OMB Control Number: 0572-0100.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Abstract: The RE Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 901 *et seq.*), authorizes and empowers the Administrator of RUS to make loans in the several United States and Territories of the United States for rural Electrification and the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service. The RE Act also authorizes and empowers the Administrator of RUS to provide financial assistance to borrowers for purposes provided in the RE Act by accommodating or subordinating loans made by the national Rural Utilities Cooperative Finance Corporation, the Federal Financing Bank, and other lending agencies. Title 7 CFR part 1717, subparts R & S sets forth policy and procedures to facilitate and support borrowers' efforts to obtain private sector financing of their capital needs, to allow borrowers greater flexibility in the management of their business affairs

without compromising RUS loan security, and to reduce the cost to borrowers, in terms of time, expenses and paperwork, of obtaining lien accommodations and subordinations. The information required to be submitted is limited to necessary information that would allow the Agency to make a determination on the borrower's request to subordinate and accommodate their lien with other lenders.

Estimate of Burden: Public Reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 19 hours per response.

Respondents: Not-for-profit institutions; Business or other for profit.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 21.

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 1.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 290 hours.

Copies of this information collection can be obtained from MaryPat Daskal, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, at (202) 720-7853. FAX: (202) 720-8435.

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: July 16, 2015.

Brandon McBride,

Administrator, Rural Utilities Service.

[FR Doc. 2015-18111 Filed 7-23-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-970]

Multilayered Wood Flooring From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With the Final Determination and Amended Final Determination of the Antidumping Duty Investigation

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: On July 6, 2015, the United States Court of International Trade ("CIT") issued *Changzhou Hawd Flooring Co. v. United States*, Ct. No. 12-20, Slip Op. 15-71 (CIT July 6, 2015), affirming the Department of Commerce's (the "Department") amended final determination of sales at less than fair value in the antidumping duty investigation on multilayered wood flooring from the People's Republic of China ("*Amended Final*

Determination’),¹ as modified by the Department’s fourth remand redetermination pursuant to court order.

Consistent with the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (“CAFC”) in *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (“*Timken*”), as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades Mfrs. Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (“*Diamond Sawblades*”), the Department is notifying the public that the Court’s final judgment in this case is not in harmony with the *Amended Final Determination*, and that the Department is revising its *Amended Final Determination*.

DATES: *Effective Date:* July 16, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Galantucci and Brandon Farlander, Office IV, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2923 and (202) 482–0182, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The litigation in this case relates to the Department’s final determination in the antidumping duty investigation covering multilayered wood flooring from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”),² which was later amended.³ Pursuant to a series of remand orders issued by the CIT⁴ that resulted in four remand redeterminations,⁵ the Department: (1) Revised its calculation of dumping margins for two mandatory respondents and the PRC-wide entity; and (2) the Department made certain findings regarding the dumping margins

for eight separate rate respondents that were plaintiffs in the litigation, as summarized below.⁶

Regarding the dumping margins for two mandatory respondents in the investigation, on April 23, 2014, the CIT granted a consent motion for severance and entered final judgment in *Baroque Timber Industries (Zhongshan) Company, Limited v. United States and Zhejiang Layo Wood Industry Co., Ltd. v. United States* with respect to Layo Wood and the Samling Group.⁷ The Department previously gave notice of this decision, as well as the amended dumping margins of zero percent calculated for Layo Wood and Samling Group, in accordance with the notice requirements of *Timken*.⁸ Further, because we changed the surrogate values in our first remand redetermination for mandatory respondents Layo Wood and Samling Group, the highest calculated transaction-specific rate on the record became 25.62 percent, and we assigned that rate to the PRC-wide entity.⁹

Regarding the dumping margins for the eight separate rate respondents that were plaintiffs to this litigation, the CIT issued a series of a remand orders before affirming the Department’s fourth remand redetermination.¹⁰ As a result of the Department’s second redetermination on remand, the Department assigned to seven of the eight separate rate respondents above *de minimis* antidumping duty rates for the investigation, but found that it was unnecessary to calculate an exact rate for those respondents because any rate assigned for the investigation stage of the proceeding would be superseded by the rates assigned to those companies in the first administrative review and would not be used for liquidation purposes. The CIT affirmed this portion of the Department’s remand

redetermination on January 23, 2015.¹¹ However, the eighth separate rate respondent, Changzhou Hawd Flooring Co. (“Changzhou Hawd”), did not have any shipments of subject merchandise during the first period of review and the Department did not assign Changzhou Hawd a separate rate from the first administrative review. Thus, in a fourth remand redetermination, the Department assigned Changzhou Hawd a margin of 3.30 percent (Changzhou Hawd’s original rate from the Department’s *Amended Final Determination* in the investigation),¹² effective for cash deposit purposes only, pending final establishment in the second administrative review of Changzhou Hawd’s new cash deposit rate and assessment rate. On July 6, 2015, the CIT found that the Department’s methodology in applying this rate was supported by substantial evidence and in accordance with law.¹³ Subsequent to the CIT’s entry of judgment, the Department published the final results of the second administrative review, which have superseded the cash deposit rate of 3.30 percent assigned to Changzhou Hawd for purposes of this litigation.¹⁴

Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*, as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*, the CAFC held that, pursuant to section 516A(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”), the Department must publish a notice of a court decision that is not “in harmony” with a Department determination and must suspend

¹ See *Multilayered Wood Flooring from the People’s Republic of China: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 76 FR 64318 (October 18, 2011) (“*Final Determination*”); *Multilayered Wood Flooring From the People’s Republic of China: Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order*, 76 FR 76690 (December 8, 2011) (“*Amended Final Determination*”).

² See *Final Determination*, 76 FR at 64318.

³ See *Amended Final Determination*, 76 FR at 76690.

⁴ See *Baroque Timber Indus. (Zhongshan) Co., Ltd. v. United States*, 925 F. Supp. 2d 1332 (CIT July 31, 2013); *Baroque Timber Indus. (Zhongshan) Co., Ltd. v. United States*, 971 F. Supp. 2d 1333 (CIT March 31, 2014); *Changzhou Hawd Flooring Co. v. United States*, 44 F. Supp. 3d 1376 (CIT January 23, 2015).

⁵ See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Order, Court No. 12–00007, dated November 14, 2013; Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Order, Court No. 12–00007, dated May 29, 2014; Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Order, Court No. 12–00020, dated October 14, 2014; and Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Order, Court No. 12–00020, dated March 24, 2015.

⁶ The eight separate rate respondents were cooperative respondents, but were not individually investigated in the antidumping duty investigation.

⁷ The full names of those companies are Zhejiang Layo Wood Industry Co. Ltd. (“Layo Wood”) and Baroque Timber Industries (Zhongshan) Co., Ltd., Riverside Plywood Corporation, Samling Elegant Living Trading (Labuan) Limited, Samling Global USA, Inc., Samling Riverside Co., Ltd., and Suzhou Times Flooring Co., Ltd. (collectively, “the Samling Group”).

⁸ See *Multilayered Wood Flooring from the People’s Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With the Final Determination and Amended Final Determination of the Antidumping Duty Investigation*, 79 FR 25109 (May 2, 2014).

⁹ See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Order, Court No. 12–00007, dated November 14, 2013, at 27.

¹⁰ See *Changzhou Hawd Flooring Co. v. United States*, Ct. No. 12–20, Slip Op. 15–71 (CIT July 6, 2015).

¹¹ See *Changzhou Hawd Flooring Co. v. United States*, 44 F. Supp. 3d 1376, 1387–88 (CIT January 23, 2015). The seven respondents to which the Department’s determination applied were: Fine Furniture (Shanghai) Limited, Armstrong Wood Products (Kunshan) Co., Ltd., Dunhua City; Jisen Wood Industry Co., Ltd., Dunhua City Dexin Wood Industry Co., Ltd., Dalian Huilong Wooden Products Co., Ltd., Kunshan Yingyi-Nature Wood Industry Co., Ltd., and Karly Wood Product Limited.

¹² This cash deposit rate of 3.30 percent was the original rate applied to Changzhou Hawd in the *Amended Final Determination*. The rate was calculated by taking the simple average of the two non-*de minimis* rates calculated for Layo Wood and the Samling Group in the *Amended Final Determination*. Although Layo Wood’s and the Samling Group’s rates were subsequently changed on remand (thus altering the basis for Changzhou Hawd’s 3.30 percent rate), the Department provided evidence that the rate was “reasonably reflective” of Changzhou Hawd’s “potential dumping margin,” and the CIT sustained this determination. See *Changzhou Hawd*, Slip Op. 15–71 (CIT July 6, 2015), at 11.

¹³ See *Changzhou Hawd*, Slip Op. 15–71 (CIT July 6, 2015), at 3–4.

¹⁴ See *Multilayered Wood Flooring From the People’s Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Final Results of New Shipper Review; 2012–2013*, 80 FR 41476 (July 15, 2015).

liquidation of entries pending a “conclusive” court decision.

The CIT’s July 6, 2015 final judgment affirming the Department’s redetermination constitutes a final decision of the Court that is not in harmony with the original *Amended Final Determination*. This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken*.

Amended Final Determination

There is now a final court decision with respect to the *Amended Final Determination* as it concerns the eight separate rate respondents and the PRC-wide entity in this matter. For the eight separate rate respondents, as of the date of this notice, all eight companies have received updated cash deposit rates, and their rates will not change as a result of this litigation. However, for the PRC-wide entity, the Department is amending the *Amended Final Determination* and the revised cash deposit rate for this entity is as follows:

Exporter	Cash deposit rate (percent)
PRC-wide entity	25.62

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 516A(e)(1), 751(a)(1), and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: July 20, 2015.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2015–18214 Filed 7–23–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Idaho National Laboratory, et al.; Notice of Consolidated Decision on Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Electron Microscope

This is a decision consolidated pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, as amended by Pub. L. 106–36; 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. in Room 3720, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC.

Docket Number: 15–005. *Applicant:* Idaho National Laboratory, Idaho Falls, ID 83415. *Instrument:* Electron Microscope. *Manufacturer:* FEI, Czech Republic. *Intended Use:* See notice at 80 FR 26896, May 11, 2015.

Docket Number: 15–010. *Applicant:* Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Chevy Chase, MD 20815. *Instrument:* Electron Microscope. *Manufacturer:* JEOL Ltd., Japan. *Intended Use:* See notice at 80 FR 26896, May 11, 2015.

Docket Number: 15–011. *Applicant:* University of South Alabama, Mobile, AL 36688. *Instrument:* Electron Microscope. *Manufacturer:* FEI Czech Republic s.r.o., Czech Republic. *Intended Use:* See notice at 80 FR 26896, May 11, 2015.

Docket Number: 15–012. *Applicant:* Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University, Bronx, NY 10461. *Instrument:* Electron Microscope. *Manufacturer:* JEOL Ltd., Japan. *Intended Use:* See notice at 80 FR 26896, May 11, 2015.

Docket Number: 15–014. *Applicant:* Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218. *Instrument:* Electron Microscope. *Manufacturer:* FEI Company, the Netherlands. *Intended Use:* See notice at 80 FR 26896, May 11, 2015.

Docket Number: 15–016. *Applicant:* Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08901. *Instrument:* LN Microscope. *Manufacturer:* Luigs Neumann, Germany. *Intended Use:* See notice at 80 FR 26896, May 1, 2015.

Docket Number: 15–017. *Applicant:* City University of New York, New York, NY 10017. *Instrument:* Electron Microscope.

Manufacturer: FEI Company, Japan. *Intended Use:* See notice at 80 FR 26896, May 11, 2015.

Docket Number: 15–018. *Applicant:* City University of New York, New York, NY 10017. *Instrument:* Electron Microscope. *Manufacturer:* FEI Company, Japan. *Intended Use:* See notice at 80 FR 26896, May 11, 2015.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as these instruments are intended to be used, was being manufactured in the United States at the time the instruments were ordered. Reasons: Each foreign instrument is an electron microscope and is intended for research or scientific educational uses requiring an electron microscope. We know of no electron microscope, or any other instrument suited to these purposes, which was being manufactured in the United States at the time of order of each instrument.

Dated: July 20, 2015.

Gregory W. Campbell,

Director, Subsidies Enforcement Office, Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2015–18212 Filed 7–23–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–933]

Frontseating Service Valves From the People’s Republic of China; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013–2014

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: On April 8, 2015, the Department of Commerce (“the Department”) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty on frontseating service valves from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”).¹ The period of review is April 1, 2013, through April 28, 2014. The review covers one exporter of the subject merchandise, Zhejiang Sanhua Co., Ltd. (“Sanhua”). We find that Sanhua made no sales in the United States at prices below normal value. None of the interested parties submitted case or rebuttal briefs. Therefore, we made no changes to our margin calculations for Sanhua. The final weighted-average dumping margin for this review is listed below in the section entitled “Final Results of the Review.”

DATES: Effective date: July 24, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Laurel LaCivita, AD/CVD Operations, Office III, Enforcement and Compliance, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4243.

Background

On April 8, 2015, the Department published the preliminary results of the subject administrative review of the order.² At that time, we invited interested parties to comment on our preliminary results.

Subsequent to the *Preliminary Results*, Sanhua placed comments on the record concerning the *Preliminary Results*³ in lieu of a case brief. No other party provided comments on our *Preliminary Results*.

¹ See *Frontseating Service Valves from the People’s Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013–2014*, 80 FR 18811 (April 8, 2015) (“*Preliminary Results*”).

² *Id.*

³ See letter from Sanhua, “Frontseating Service Valves from the People’s Republic of China; A–570–933; Comments by Zhejiang Sanhua Co., Ltd. Regarding the Preliminary Results,” dated May 8, 2015 (“Sanhua’s Comment Letter”).